

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA**

MOREHOUSE ENTERPRISES LLC d/b/a)	
BRIDGE CITY ORDNANCE <i>et al.</i>,)	Case No. 3:22-cv-00116-PDW-ARS
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO,)	
FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES <i>et al.</i>,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

JOINT STATUS REPORT

On December 9, 2024, the Court directed the parties to file a joint status report by May 1, 2025. Status Report Order, Dec. 9, 2024 (Doc. No. 157). In accordance with the Court’s Order, the parties now respectfully file this Joint Status Report.

1. This case involves an Administrative Procedure Act challenge to a rule issued by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (“ATF”) pertaining to firearms, 87 Fed. Reg. 24,652 (Apr. 26, 2022) (codified at 24 C.F.R pts. 447, 478, and 479).

2. In February 2024, Defendants filed an unopposed motion to stay proceedings in this case pending the final disposition of a petition for certiorari in *Garland v. VanDerStok*, No. 23-852 (S. Ct.), a case involving an Administrative Procedure Act challenge to the same rule challenged here. Doc. No. 137. The Court granted the motion and stayed proceedings in this case. Doc. No. 138.

3. Following the Court’s entry of a stay, the Supreme Court granted the certiorari petition in *VanDerStok*. *Garland v. VanDerStok*, 144 S. Ct. 1390 (2024). On March 26, 2025, the Supreme Court held that the challenged rule is facially consistent with the Gun Control Act of 1968, 18 U.S.C. § 921 *et seq.* (“GCA”). See *Bondi v. VanDerStok*, 145 S. Ct. 857, 874 (2025) (“The plaintiffs do not challenge ATF’s new rule as applied to particular products. They argue only that [it] is facially

inconsistent with the GCA. . . . [W]e have no trouble rejecting that unqualified view.”); *see also id.* at 876 (concluding that “[t]he GCA embraces, and thus permits ATF to regulate, some weapon parts kits and unfinished frames or receivers, including those we have discussed”).

4. A recent Executive Order has directed the Attorney General to “review . . . [r]ules promulgated by the Department of Justice, including by [ATF], from January 2021 through January 2025 pertaining to firearms. . . .” Exec. Order No. 14,206, 90 Fed. Reg. 9503 (Feb. 7, 2025). The parties therefore respectfully request that the Court maintain the present stay to allow the Attorney General to review the underlying rule at issue in this case. The parties further respectfully suggest that they file a further joint status report in this case on or before August 1, 2025.

Dated: May 1, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

YAAKOV M. ROTH
Acting Assistant Attorney General

ALEXANDER K. HAAS
Director, Federal Programs Branch

LESLEY FARBY
Deputy Director, Federal Programs Branch

/s/ Daniel Riess
DANIEL RIESS
JEREMY S.B. NEWMAN
Trial Attorneys
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
1100 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 353-3098
Email: Daniel.Riess@usdoj.gov
Attorneys for Defendants

/s/ Stephen D. Stamboulieh
Stephen D. Stamboulieh (MS # 102784)
Stamboulieh Law, PLLC
P.O. Box 428
Olive Branch, MS 38654
(601) 852-3440
stephen@sdslaw.us

Robert J. Olson (VA # 82488)
William J. Olson, PC
370 Maple Ave. West, Suite 4
Vienna, VA 22180-5615
703-356-5070 (T)
703-356-5085 (F)
wjo@mindspring.com

Counsel for Morehouse Enterprises, LLC d/b/a Bridge City Ordnance, Eliezer Jimenez, Gun Owners of America, Inc., and Gun Owners Foundation

/s/ Christian B. Corrigan
CHRISTIAN B. CORRIGAN
Solicitor General
PETER M. TORSTENSEN, JR.
Deputy Solicitor General
MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
P.O. Box 201401
Helena, MT 59620-1401
Phone: (406) 444-2026
christian.corrigan@mt.gov
peter.torstensen@mt.gov

Counsel for Plaintiff State of Montana

PATRICK MORRISEY
West Virginia Attorney General

MICHAEL R. WILLIAMS
Solicitor General
OFFICE OF THE WEST VIRGINIA ATTORNEY GENERAL
State Capitol, Bldg 1, Room E-26
Charleston, WV 25305
(681) 313-4550
Michael.R.Williams@wvago.gov

Counsel for Plaintiff State of West Virginia